REMARKS

Filed concurrently herewith is a Request for Three-Month Extension of Time which extends the shortened statutory period of response to March 24, 2004. Accordingly, It is respectfully submitted that this response is being timely filed.

The Official Action dated September 24, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 8, 9 and 13-23 directed to a non-elected invention have been cancelled, claim 10 has been amended and new claim 25 has been added in order to better define that which applicants' regard as the invention. Accordingly, claims 10, 12, 24 and 25 are presently pending in the instant application.

Referring now the Official Action and particularly paragraphs 3-7, Applicants' hereby confirm the election of Group I, claims 1-7 and 10-12 as well as subsequently adding claims 24 and 25 with only claims 10, 12, 24 and 25 remaining pending in the instant application. It is further noted that the inventorship continues to be proper in the present application.

Referring now to paragraph 9 of the Official Action, claims 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph is being indefinite for failing to particularly point out indistinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the scope of claim 10 is confusing in that it is not clear what type of molecular weight is referred to therein, and whether this refers to weight average, number average, etc.

As can be seen for the foregoing amendments, claim 10 has been amended to better define the molecular weight referred to therein as a weight average molecular weight as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 10 as presently amended, as well as dependent claim 12 are in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference now to paragraph 12 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,514,745 issued to Yoshino in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,409,991 issued to Mitsuno et al. This rejection was respectfully traversed that the combination proposed by the Examiner neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by applicants' claimed invention.

As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, the present invention is directed to a long glass fiber filler reinforced resin material for molding which includes a masterbatch comprising a matrix polymer of a homopolypropylene having a pentad isotactic index of at least 95% and a weight average molecular weight of 70,000 to 125,000, a long glass fiber filler included in a content of 30 to 50 mass percent with respect to a total mass, a surface of the long glass fiber filler being treated with a coupling agent and an affinity providing component included in a content of 1.9 to 20 mass percent with respect to a total mass and a diluent polymer of an ethylene-propylene block copolymer comprising a polypropylene component having a pentad isotactic index of at least 95%, the diluent polymer having an islands-sea structure in which domains of a polyethylene component are formed in the polypropylene component.

Particularly, the distinguishing features of the present invention reside in that the affinity providing component is included in a content of 1.9 to 20 mass percent with respect to a total mass and the diluent polymer has an islands-sea structure.

In accordance with the initial feature, high adhesive properties of the long glass fiber filler to the matrix polymer can be provided without decreasing the physical properties of the molded article which is obtained. When the affinity providing component is included in a content of less than 1.9 mass percent, high adhesive properties cannot be obtained. Additionally, when the affinity providing component is included in a content of more that 20

mass percent, the affinity providing component becomes maleic anhydride-denatured polypropylene and/or acrylic acid-denatured polypropylene, and thus a functional group thereof inhibits the crystallization thereby leading to a molded article having low physical properties.

Furthermore, in accordance with the second feature noted in accordance with the present invention, as described in the specification, since and inflicted impact is energy-absorbed in the boundary portion between the polypropylene component and the polyethylene component, the impact strength of the resulting molded article can be improved.

With respect to the teachings of Yoshino et al., this reference disclose an affinity providing component as set for in the examples of 25 wt%, which is more than the affinity providing component of the present invention. Thus, as discussed hereinabove, Yoshino et al. cannot provide a molded article having the high physical properties which are achieved in accordance with the present invention. Furthermore, Yoshino fails to disclose or suggest the particular range of the amount of the affinity providing component as recited an independent claim 10.

In addition to the foregoing, Yoshino also fails to disclose or suggest that the diluent polymer includes an islands-sea structure in which the domains of the polyethylene component are formed in a polypropylene component, again, as specifically recited in independent claim 10.

With respect to the teachings Mitsuno et al., this reference discloses graft polypropylene (A) of 51 wt% and (B) of 50 wt% as noted in examples 22 (Table 9-1) and 45 (TABLE 26-1), which may correspond to the affinity providing component of the present invention. However, this amount is clearly more than that set forth in accordance with applicants' claimed invention. Consequently, Mitsuno et al. cannot provide a molded article

having the high physical properties in accordance with applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, Mitsuno et al. fails to disclose or suggest the range of the amount of the affinity providing component recited in the present invention, that being 1.9 to 20 mass percent with respect to a total mass.

Further, as with the Yoshino reference, Mitsuno et al. fails to disclose the diluent polymer as including an islands-sea structured in which the domains of the polyethylene component are formed in a polypropylene component.

While the Examiner in rejecting applicants' claimed invention asserts that since Mitsuno et al. discloses an isotactic pentad index of the matrix polymer as 97% or greater, the present invention is unpatentable over combination of Yoshino in view of Mitsuno et al., clearly, this is not the case, in that the isotactic pentad index referred to an index of stereoregularity of polymers. The modified matrix polymer disclosed in Yoshino et al. causes disarrangement of the molecular structure, and thereby high isotactic pentad index cannot be obtained. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it is substantially impossible to apply the high isotactic pentad index disclosed in Mitsuno et al. to the modified matrix polymer disclosed in Yoshino et al. Consequently, it is believed that the combination proposed by the Examiner is clearly improper in that in combining the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the teachings of the base reference would be destroyed.

While the Examiner states on page 11 of the Office Action that Mitsuno et al. is used as a teaching reference and therefore it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, it is noted that it is clearly understood that the teachings of the secondary reference when combined with the primary reference cannot be such that the intent of the primary reference or the jist of the invention set forth in the primary reference cannot be destroyed when such combination as made.

Accordingly, for the reasons discuss hereinabove it is respectfully submitted that applicants' claimed invention as set forth claims 10, 12, 24 and 25 clearly distinguishes over the prior art record and are proper condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 10, 12, 24 and 25 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000